



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

those that have made the acquaintance of a book, or for those that have not? For myself, I can answer that I care most for the reviews of those books that I have not seen. In conclusion, I wish to say that Mr. Gage is a stranger to me, and I have never had any sort of communication with him. Whatever one might say in his behalf, my remarks were not made for his benefit, but to point out what I believe to be one of the first duties of the reviewer of a scientific book to his readers.

S. T. M.

Lexington, Va., June 13.

[The limited space at our command will not allow of extended analyses of the many text-books of science which are continually appearing. A short notice either of their general merit or demerit is all we can give. In the case of Gage's 'Elements of physics,' the reviewer used the book as a text to preach against the common custom of teachers in using the atomic theory in their explanations as if we knew definitely that atoms exist.]

Solar constant.

Prof. C. A. Young has kindly called my attention to an unintentional oversight in my article entitled 'Solar constant' (SCIENCE, p. 542). In the general equation sent me by him, t represents 'degrees of heat,' not 'quantity of heat;' and m represents 'time,' not 'unit of time.'

H. A. HAZEN.

A zoo-philological problem.

On the New-England coast, where *Mya arenaria* is abundant, and known as the 'clam,' an annelid which is common in the same localities is called the 'he-clam,' and is believed by many fishermen to be the male of the mollusk.

In Norway, *Mya arenaria* is abundant in the fiords of the north. It has no economic uses; but its associate, an annelid, the 'pür' (said to be *Arenicola piscatorum*), is an important bait, and gives its name to the *Mya* which is called the 'piirschaa.'

Why should the common annelid and the common mollusk be thus associated in popular nomenclature in remote regions? It is interesting to observe that the form possessing commercial value in each instance gives its name to the one which is in lower esteem.

G. BROWN GOODE.

The sun's radiation and geological climate.

In my objecting (SCIENCE, p. 395) to the assumption that the dissipation of solar energy from loss of heat diminishes the supply of sun-heat received by the earth, I said, that, so far as there has been any change in the supply, it has been in the direction of an increase, and hence cannot explain the undoubted decrease in the temperature of the earth's atmosphere. I think Professor Le Conte's criticism (SCIENCE, p. 543), taken in its entirety, corroborates my position. He shows that the quantity of heat incident normally on a unit of surface in a unit of time varies as the area of a great circle of the sun \times heat-emitting power of each physical point of the sun: hence the quantity emitted would not increase, unless the heat-emitting power increased faster than the square of the temperature. He adds that "some physicists (Rossetti) make the latter proportional to the square of the absolute temperature, while others (Stephan) make it as high as the fourth power." If Rossetti is right, there has been no decrease in the amount of solar heat received; while, if Stephan is right, there has been a very great increase: for, on the assumption that the temperature is inversely as the radius, as stated in Professor Newcomb's article (Popular

astronomy, p. 508), the heat-emitting power, if the solar radius is reduced to one-half, will be increased four times, and will just compensate for the great circle being reduced four times in area. If the emissive power increases, as Stephan claims, then a doubled temperature will increase it sixteen times, and, the area being diminished only to one-fourth, the earth will receive quadruple the heat.

It is true that the heat-emitting power of any (solid) body varies according to the area of its surface, providing all the other conditions are unchanged. In case of solids and liquids, very little change can be made in their density by any force that we can apply, — so little, indeed, that no appreciable effect can be produced; but gases are easily affected, and there is no difficulty in conceiving them reduced many times in bulk. Now, suppose two spheres, e.g., of hydrogen, of equal masses and of the same temperature, but one having twice the radius of the other. They will radiate equal amounts in equal times, as I shall try to show. I assume that the radiation goes on only from points of matter, — the atoms of the hydrogen. Conceive each sphere made up of a vast number of concentric layers, each one molecule thick. The number of layers will be the same, and the number of molecules in each will also be the same: consequently the heat-emission of the outside layer will be the same in both spheres. What would be true of the first layer would be true of all, unless the outer one intercepts some of the rays. So far as the outer layer is gaseous and elementary (it is very doubtful whether any chemical compounds can exist in the intense heat of the sun), it is a vacuum to radiant heat; for Professor Tyndall, in 'Heat considered as a mode of motion,' has shown (p. 362) this in reference to oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, and air, and, in general (see rest of the lecture), that elementary gases or vapors produce little or no effect upon the radiant heat that passes through them. It must be remembered, too, that the source of heat employed in his experiments was icy-cold in comparison with the sun, and that the penetrating power of heat-rays increases as the temperature of their source rises. It is therefore probable that the heat from the lower layers passes through the upper ones, so far as they are gaseous, with little or no loss, and hence that in gaseous bodies the heat-emitting power for any given temperature is proportional, not to the surface, but to the mass or density.

But suppose that diffused through the upper layers were molecules that were capable of stopping every ray that impinged upon them. Neither the absolute number nor the size of these bodies would be affected by shortening the radius, but only the space between them. If the radius were reduced to one-half, the apertures would be reduced in area to one-fourth, while the radiating molecules within any given distance would be increased eightfold: in other words, the chances of not passing out into space would be increased only four times, while the number of shots would be increased eight times; so that, in this case, the heat-emissive power would be actually increased by the condensation. If to this be added an increase of the same power from the rise of temperature (either as the square or the fourth power, *Rossetti* or *Stephan*), there can, I think, be no doubt that any change which has occurred in the earth's temperature from the sun's losing energy has not been in the direction of growing cooler.

As a corollary of the above, I add, the radiant or heat-emitting power of a sphere of gas appears to be a function of mass and temperature, and not of surface and temperature.